

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 186 554

UD 020 553

AUTHOR Bonn, Robert I.
TITLE District E.S.E.A. Title I Programs and Impact Aid (PL 81-874) Programs. Final Evaluation Report, 1978-1979.
INSTITUTION Community School District 21, Brooklyn, N.Y.
PUB DATE Jul 79
NOTE 32p.
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement; *Compensatory Education; *Diagnostic Teaching; Educationally Disadvantaged; Elementary Education; Individualized Instruction; Junior High Schools; Paraprofessional School Personnel; Program Descriptions; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; *Reading Programs; Teacher Role
IDENTIFIERS *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; *Impact Aid; New York (Brooklyn)

ABSTRACT

The District 21, 1978-79 Title I Reading Program had three basic components: (1) Augmented Reading Services, (2) Optional Assignment, and (3) Non Public Schools. The Augmented Reading Services component operated in six elementary schools, reaching a total of more than 1,300 students defined as below minimum competency and unserved by other programs. This component utilized a diagnostic/prescriptive approach and individual or small group instruction. Its effectiveness is reflected in the high ratios of actual to expected mean gains for program participants at each grade level. The Optional Assignment component served more than 300 educationally disadvantaged students in twelve non-Title I elementary schools. Like the first component, Optional Assignment showed greater than expected mean achievement gains at every grade level. A supplementary program, Impact Aid, made it possible for Augmented Reading Services and Optional Assignment to effectively serve an additional 245 students. The final component of the program was one in which paraprofessionals worked together with teachers assigned to three non-public schools located in District 21. Their efforts were helpful in providing individualization of instruction. Overall, the strength of the Title I reading program may be attributed to the small group instruction. Its effectiveness is reflected in the dedication of teachers and paraprofessionals and effective utilization of individualized, diagnostic/prescriptive instruction. (Author/GC)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

APR 29 1980

"Official Copy of the Evaluation, Approved as Submitted by the
Community School Board President and/or the Community Superin-
tendent, District 21 on APR 13 1979, 1979."

Signature: *[Signature]*

Title I Function Numbers:

5073-91622

5073-91623

5073-91624 (NPS)

Impact Aid Numbers:

5073-98722

5073-98723

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Edmonds

NYC Bd of Ed

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

FOR THE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

DISTRICT 21 E.S.E.A. TITLE I PROGRAMS

AND

IMPACT AID (PL 81-874) PROGRAMS

1978 - 1979

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT
OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Program Title

Function Number

Augmented Reading Services

Title I 5073-91622

Impact Aid No. 5073-98722

Optional Assignment Program

Title I 5073-91623

Impact Aid No. 5073-98723

Non-Public Schools Program

Title I 5073-91624

An evaluation of three New York school District
educational projects funded under Title I of the
Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965
(PL 89-10) and Impact Aid (PL 81-874), performed
by consultant evaluators to the Board of Educa-
tion of the City of New York for the 1978-79
school year.

Submitted to:

COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT 21

Submitted by:

Robert L. Bonn, Ph.D.
85 Jefferson Street
Garden City, New York 11530

July 1979

ED186554

UDO 20553

TITLE:

Final Evaluation Report for the
District 21 E.S.E.A. Title I and
Impact Aid (PL 81-874) Programs
1978-1979

Augmented Reading Services
Title I Function Number 5073-91622
Impact Aid Number 5073-98722

Optional Assignment Program
Title I Function Number 5073-91623
Impact Aid Number 5073-98723

Non-Public Schools Program
Title I Function Number 5073-91624

CONSULTANT EVALUATORS

Robert L. Bonn, Ph.D.

Annette Mont, M.A.

Ethel V. Bonn, M.A.

FOREWARD

This final evaluation report covers three programs that were conducted by District 21 during the 1978-79 academic year. All were funded under Title I of the Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

This evaluation was planned and conducted by Robert L. Bonn who had prime responsibility for the on-site observations, interviews and the analysis and interpretation of test scores and other data. Annette Mont and Ethel V. Bonn provided professional assistance with the on-site observations and interviews and provided input into the materials used in this report.

The evaluators hereby express their appreciation for the generous cooperation they received from the District's Board of Education, the District Director of Funded Programs and the principals, teachers and other personnel in the schools.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreward	<u>Page</u> iii
List of Tables	vi
Executive Summary	
Augmented Reading Services 5073-91622	vii
Optional Assignment Program 5073-91623	vii
Impact Aid 5073-98722	
(Augmented Reading Services)	viii
Impact Aid 5073-98723	
(Optional Assignment)	viii
Non Public School 5073-91624	viii
Introduction	
A. Augmented Reading Services	
Function Number 5073-91622	1
1. Overview	1
2. Evaluation Activities	2
3. Findings	
A. Interviews and Observations	2
B. Test Results	6
4. Summary	8
B. Optional Assignment Program	
Function Number 5073-91623	10
1. Overview	10
2. Evaluation Activities	11
3. Findings	
A. Interviews and Observations	12
B. Test Results	14
4. Summary	14
C. Impact Aid	
Function Number ARS 5073-98722	
OA 5073-98723	16
1. Overview	16
2. Test Scores	18
3. Summary	19

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

	<u>Page</u>
D. Non Public Schools	
Function Number 5073-91624	20
1. Overview	20
2. Findings	20
 Title I Programs	
Conclusion and Recommendations	22

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
One	<u>Augmented Reading Services: Results of Stanford Achievement Test: Grade Equivalent Scores: Pretest, Predicted Posttest and Actual Posttest Means: Predicted Mean Gain, Actual Mean Gain, and Ratio of Actual to Predicted Mean Gain.</u>	7
Two	<u>Optional Assignment: Results of Stanford Achievement Test: Grade Equivalent Scores: Pretest, Predicted Posttest and Actual Posttest Means: Predicted Mean Gain, Actual Mean Gain, and Ratio of Actual to Predicted Mean Gain.</u>	13
Three	<u>Impact Aid - Augmented Reading Services: Results of Stanford Achievement Test: Grade Equivalent Scores: Pretest, Predicted Posttest and Actual Posttest Means: Predicted Mean Gain, Actual Mean Gain and Ratio of Actual to Predicted Mean Gain.</u>	17
Four	<u>Impact Aid - Optional Assignment: Results of Stanford Achievement Test: Grade Equivalent Scores: Pretest, Predicted Posttest and Actual Posttest Means; Predicted Mean Gain, Actual Mean Gain and Ratio of Actual to Predicted Mean Gain.</u>	17 & 18

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The District 21, 1978-79 Title I Reading Program had three basic components; Augmented Reading Services, Optional Assignment and Non-Public Schools. There was also a supplementary program of Impact Aid which expanded the services offered in Augmented Reading Services and Optional Assignment.

Augmented Reading Services Function Number 5073-91622

Operating in 6 elementary schools, the Augmented Reading Services Component reached a total of more than 1300 students at grade levels 1 through 6. The target population consisted of students below minimum competency and not serviced by another program. Utilizing a diagnostic-prescriptive approach and individual or small group instruction, New York City licensed teachers met with groups of 15 students for five instructional periods per week. The effectiveness of the component may be seen in the dramatically high ratios of actual to expected mean gains for program participants at each grade level.

Optional Assignment Function Number 5073-91623

Operating at 12 of the District 21 non-Title I elementary schools, the Optional Assignment Component serviced more than 300 students at grade levels 1 through 6. The target population consisted of educationally disadvantaged students who resided in attendance areas of a designated Title I school but elected to attend District 21 receiving schools under Optional Assignment. Utilizing a program methodology similar to that of the Augmented Reading Services Component, Optional Assignment also

showed mean gains, greater than those that would have been expected, at every grade level.

Impact Aid - Augmented Reading Services
Function Number 5073 - 98722

Impact Aid - Optional Assignment
Function Number 5073 - 98723

Impact Aid expanded the services of both program components and make it possible to service an additional 245 students. For Impact Aid Augmented Reading Services, there were program gains at each grade level. Although Impact Aid Optional Assignment also showed gains at each grade level, the numbers of program participants were too small to perform meaningful statistical calculations. The only exception was grade 8 where the actual mean gain was very much in excess of the expected gain.

Non-Public Schools
Function Number 5073-91624

The Non-Public Schools Component was one in which paraprofessionals worked in support of New York City Central Board of Education Title I teachers assigned to three Non Public Schools located in the District. Their efforts were very helpful in providing individualization of instruction. The statistical analysis of pre and posttest scores is to be handled by the Central Board.

Overall, the strength of the Title I Reading Program may be attributed to the dedicated teachers and paraprofessionals who staff it. Effective utilization of the pull out approach, including individualized, diagnostic-prescriptive instruction fully articulated with the tax levy program at the host schools, has enabled Title I to make a most positive contribution to District 21's educational effort.

Recommendations concerning recycling, the pull out approach, uninterrupted sustained silent reading, in service training for certification, parental involvement, writing skill development and paraprofessional work in non-public schools are offered.

1x

AUGMENTED READING SERVICES COMPONENT
Function Number 5073-91622

Component Overview

The Augmented Reading Services (ARS) Component of the 1978-79 District 21, Title I Reading effort was designed to supplement the classroom program of instruction at designated Title I schools. The component operated at PS 90, PS 188, PS 212, PS 225, PS 288 and PS 329. In all, more than 1300 students at grade levels 1 through 6 were serviced.

The ARS Component's staff consisted of 17 full time and 1 part time (.6 position) teachers who were New York City licensed and had specialized expertise in teaching of reading skills. In addition, there were 32 educational assistants working with teachers in the classroom and 8 family assistants who provided supplemental services designed to bridge the home-school gap. At the schools staffed by three or more teachers, program efforts were coordinated by one teacher, often the senior one, who was designated as school coordinator. At the district level, program efforts were coordinated by the District's Director of Funded Programs and a Reading Consultant, half of whose position was funded under the ARS Component.

The aim of the ARS Component was to produce gains in reading ability that would be evidenced in significant increases in mean reading scores of the program participants at each grade level. The instructional approach was diagnostic-prescriptive with small groups pulled out of their regular classroom for intensive instruction in reading and reading skill development. The pull out period was 45 minutes per day, 5 days per week.

Evaluation Activities

The ARS Component was evaluated through a series of field visits to the participating schools. Each school was visited once and several were visited more often. During these visits, classes were observed and principals, teachers and paraprofessionals were interviewed. In addition, the Component's coordinators were interviewed and two general staff meetings were attended. Finally, pre and posttest reading scores were analyzed in order to assess program impact upon the target population at each grade level.

Findings

A. Interviews and Observations

In light of the public debate about the utility of the pull out approach (c.f. New York Times, June 13, 1979), it must be emphatically stated at the outset that this approach operates very well and shows itself to be most effective not only in the ARS Component but also in the entire District 21 reading effort. The pull out approach allows the program teachers to give full priority to the teaching of reading. The reading priority is highlighted by the fact that each of the participating teachers is able to work in a diagnostic reading room center specifically set aside by the host schools. Without exception, these designated reading rooms were well supplied and provided an excellent environment for the program. In most cases they even served as reading resource centers for the entire school.

The observed classes saw a considerable variety of materials and approaches being utilized in the context of the program's diagnostic-prescriptive approach. Evident and in use during our observations were

materials such as BFA Skillspak, SRA Reading Laboratory, Fountain Valley diagnostic tests, Barnell Loft readers and EDL machines, not to mention a variety of teacher made materials. Nearly all of the program teachers are, quite correctly, eclectic in their approach, switching materials as appropriate to respond to individual student need and interest.

The diversity of observed activities was considerable. In one class the stress was on teaching children to repeat words and letters after they were heard on a record so that sound could be reinforced. In another, there was a lesson on root words. Still others utilized the EDL machines with their stress on particular reading skills. Some classes were completely individualized with each student pursuing his or her own course of study as teacher and educational assistants circulated through the room. In others, diagnosed needs would lead to a breakdown into two or more small groups, one coming under teacher and the other under paraprofessional guidance. In each instance, the teaching situation was kept fluid and geared to the needs of the students and the lesson being taught.

One particularly successful program feature was the uninterrupted uniform, sustained, silent reading (USSR) period, a follow through on one of the recommendations offered in last year's evaluation report. With only one exception, this practice of setting aside one period per week for "free" silent reading was universally acclaimed a success. Several teachers spoke of the sheer satisfaction for students, many of whom had never before read a book in its entirety. Others spoke of its impact on student motivation. Indeed, in at least one school the USSR period led to opening up books that had gone unused in prior years. At the end of the year, several teachers were ordering new

high interest level reading materials so that they would be available to students for the next school year.

In light of USSR's success, it would in our opinion be most appropriate for ARS Component teachers, where possible, to begin utilizing some of the USSR periods for library work. At present, library work is under the direction of classroom teachers and many libraries are underutilized because of budgetary cuts. In becoming more directly involved with their school libraries, ARS Component teachers would both employ this underutilized resource and further stimulate student interest in reading.

Supplies are in good shape at the participating schools. Despite the budgetary constrictions of the past several years, most of the teachers have been able to maintain the necessary program supplies. Where new materials have come onto the market, they have been ordered for each of the schools in the program. Furthermore, several of the teachers, after visiting the bookfair at Kennedy Airport, reported that they felt their program materials were most up to date.

The ARS Component and the Title I Reading Program generally are fortunate in that they not only have dedicated, experienced teachers but they also have most competent coordination provided by the District Director of Funded Programs and the Reading Consultant. Virtually across the board, the teachers stated that they appreciated the opportunity to go to district meetings which they found useful and informative. They also found that having some of the meetings at schools other than the district office provided an immensely valuable way to keep up on what

was happening in the field and to learn from specific techniques developed by other teachers.

One area of staff training needs particular attention for the coming school year. The need has been created by changes in the New York State certification for Title I reading teachers. At present, all of the program teachers have common branch licenses, a good proportion have MA degrees in reading and all have taken some additional courses. However, roughly one-fourth of the ARS Component and other Title I program teachers would need to take additional work to qualify for certification under the new rules. In order to do this, it would be most appropriate for the district to develop some in-service course or courses that would carry college credit. The course would be focussed on the needs of those who are presently working as reading teachers, quite effectively it might be added, but who will lack formal qualifications when the new certification rules come into effect.

Another area to which continued attention and thought should be given lies in expanding parental involvement in their children's reading. It is recognized that the large number of single parent families and the general decline in parent-child interaction are factors that schools do not have under their control. However, unless there is follow through outside of the school situation, improvements in reading or other learning abilities may well be in vain. Making the best of a difficult situation, several of the participating schools have already developed programs that have reached parents. On the other hand, others find themselves almost completely frustrated in dealing with the problem. At this point, our recommendation is that there be sharing of experience at different schools

and that program coordinators used this shared experience to develop a more comprehensive approach to this admittedly difficult problem. Family assistants, whose work joins together home and school, should also be involved in this effort.

A final area to be maintained as a program emphasis is the development of writing skills. Although the Title I programs are designed to focus on reading, it must continually be realized that reading, writing and, indeed, thinking are not isolated, compartmentalized skills. Rather they are very much interrelated; learning to write meaningful sentences, paragraphs and compositions leads to a greater understanding of how authors convey meaning. Hence, writing ability becomes translated into reading ability.

B. Test Results

In order to assess program effectiveness, we utilized a modified version of the historical regression model. The appropriate level of the Stanford Achievement subtest for reading comprehension was administered to each program participant in September 1978 (pretest) and May 1979 (posttest). Pre and posttest mean scores were calculated for students on each of the six grade levels serviced by the ARS Component. For grades 2 through 6, the pretest mean was used as the basis to compute a predicted posttest mean, i.e., the mean score one would expect if the students had continued to grow at their rate of growth prior to program participation. Predicted posttest mean gains (predicted posttest mean minus pretest mean) were then compared to the actual mean gains (posttest minus pretest mean) by means of a ratio. The ratio of actual to predicted mean gain thus became the indicator of program success; the higher the ratio,

the more "successful" the program.

Table One: Augmented Reading Services: Results of Stanford Achievement Test:
Grade Equivalent Scores: Pretest, Predicted Posttest and Actual
Posttest Means; Predicted Mean Gain, Actual Mean Gain, and Ratio
of Actual to Predicted Mean Gain.

<u>Grade</u> <u>a</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Pretest</u> <u>Mean</u>		<u>Predicted</u> <u>Posttest</u> <u>Mean</u>	<u>Posttest</u> <u>Mean</u>		<u>Predicted</u> <u>Mean</u> <u>Gain</u>	<u>Actual</u> <u>Mean</u> <u>Gain</u>		<u>Ratio of</u> <u>Actual to</u> <u>Predicted</u> <u>Mean Gain</u>
		<u>RS</u>	<u>%ile</u>		<u>RS</u>	<u>%</u>		<u>RS</u>	<u>%ile</u>	
One	199	13.86	17.86	*	22.78	23.53	*	+8.92	+5.67	*
Two	183	1.28		1.53	2.37		+ .25	+1.09		4.36
Three	217	2.14		2.65	2.93		+ .51	+ .79		1.55
Four	265	2.97		3.56	3.94		+ .59	+ .97		1.64
Five	190	3.79		4.42	5.03		+ .63	+1.24		1.97
Six	275	4.30		4.89	5.66		+ .59	+1.36		2.31
Total	1329									

<u>Late Entrants</u>		<u>Pretest</u> <u>Mean</u>	<u>Predicted</u> <u>Posttest</u> <u>Mean</u>	<u>Posttest</u> <u>Mean</u>	<u>Predicted</u> <u>Mean</u> <u>Gain</u>	<u>Actual</u> <u>Mean</u> <u>Gain</u>	<u>Ratio of</u> <u>Actual to</u> <u>Predicted</u> <u>Mean Gain</u>
<u>Grade</u>	<u>N</u>						
One	2	*	*	*	*	*	*
Two	6	1.43	*	2.33	*	+ .90	*
Three	1	*	*	*	*	*	*
Four	4	3.43	*	3.88	*	+ .45	*
Five	2	*	*	*	*	*	*
Six	7	4.07	*	4.34	*	+ .27	*

(a) Grade 1 data are raw score (RS) and percentile rankings

* Data inappropriate as insufficient to compute statistic

As Table One clearly indicates, for the ARS Component of the Title I Reading Program, actual mean gains are substantially greater than predicted mean gains at each grade level from 2 through 6. For grade 2, the ratio of 4.36 is extraordinarily high indicating that the program was dramatically successful here. Although somewhat less striking, the ratios between 1.55 and 2.31 for the other grade levels serve to state clearly that the learning rate for program participants was at a minimum $1\frac{1}{2}$ times what it would have been without the program. The late entrants, students coming into the program after December, 1978, shown on the second part of Table One, are insufficient in number to offer any general statements.

Grade 1, for which the historical model is inappropriate, also shows clear cut gains whether one utilizes raw score or percentile ranks to do the calculation. For percentile ranks, it must be kept in mind that May norming methods used by test publishers dictate considerably lower percentiles for the same raw scores. Hence, many students scored lower in percentile rankings even though they gained in raw score on the test. In the aggregate, the increases in percentile rankings are not as substantial as the increases in raw score. Nevertheless, there is still a considerable gain.

Summary

The ARS Component of the 1978-79 District 21, Title I Reading effort was most effective in its implementation. Reaching more than 1300 students in all at each of the grade levels in six of the District's elementary schools, the ARS was staffed by teachers and paraprofessionals who taught

small groups of children pulled out of regular classes one period per day, five days per week. Effectiveness is seen most dramatically in the high ratios of actual to expected mean gains for program participants at each grade level.

Program success can be attributed to the experienced and, it should be added, dedicated teachers and paraprofessionals who staff the program. Individualization of instruction and use of a variety of materials, as demanded by the situation, were key factors. The success of uniform sustained silent reading periods calls for a continuation of that part of the program. Finally, the program enjoyed the benefit of very capable coordination at the district level.

Attention is called to several areas for next year's program effort:

- the possibility of tying the USSR periods into library work.
- the need for staff training for the relatively small proportion of teachers lacking the formal qualifications under the recently revised certification requirements of New York State.
- the need for a comprehensive approach to increase parental involvement.
- the need for maintaining a program emphasis on writing skills.

OPTIONAL ASSIGNMENT COMPONENT
Function Number 5073-91623

Component Overview

In its aims and general approach, the Optional Assignment (OA) Component of the 1978-79 District 21 Title I reading effort functioned in a manner similar to the ARS Component discussed in the previous section of this report. The purpose was to produce gains in reading ability. The approach was individualized, diagnostic-prescriptive work with small groups pulled out of their regular classroom, 45 minutes per day, 5 days per week for intensive instruction in reading and reading skill development.

The OA Component differed from the ARS Component in its school sites and target population. To begin with, it operated at 12 of the District schools not designated as Title I, viz., PS 97, PS 100, PS 101, PS 121, PS 128, PS 153, PS 177, PS 199, PS 209, PS 215, PS 216 and PS 226. In each of the schools, teachers were only partly funded by Title I money, the remaining part of their position being supported by P.S.E.N. funding. In 10 of the 12 schools, Title I funds were used for .4 of one teaching position. The remaining two schools each had one, .2 teaching position funded. In terms of personnel, there were, in all, 12 teachers involved in the program. There were also 13 paraprofessionals with each teacher being assigned one.

The OA target population consisted of educationally disadvantaged children who resided in attendance areas of a designated Title I school but elected to attend District 21 receiving schools under Optional Assignment. Pupils were accepted into the program on the following

order of priorities. In grades three through nine, they had to be at or below the minimum competency and not serviced by another program. After meeting this criterion, those with the greatest need were serviced first. Secondly, those below grade level in reading who were in the program during 1977-78 and needed maintenance of effort to prevent retardation were taken. Finally, those in the first and second grades who lacked necessary beginning reading skills were serviced. Following these criteria, the OA program component serviced more than 300 students in grades 1 through 6. There were relatively fewer students in grades 1 and 2 and more in grades 5 and 6.

Like the ARS Component, OA was coordinated by the District's Director of Funded Programs and a Reading Consultant. In order to facilitate a comprehensive, district wide approach to reading, OA and ARS teachers met together for monthly meetings. This meant that the various parts of the Title I Reading Program were able to articulate well with each other. It should also be added that the partial funding of the teaching positions through P.S.E.N. allowed all district reading efforts including tax levy to be closely integrated and coordinated.

Evaluation Activities

The OA Component was evaluated through a series of field visits. During these visits, classes were observed and principals, teachers and para-professionals were interviewed. In addition, the Component's coordinators were interviewed and two general staff meetings were attended. Finally, pre and posttest reading scores were analyzed in order to assess program impact upon the target population at each grade level.

Findings

A. Interviews and Observations

Since the O.A. Component had the same aim and general approach as ARS, many of the statements made on pages 2 through 6 of this report are quite applicable here. In our discussion we will attempt to avoid repetition and, at the same time, do justice to the unique nature of the OA Component.

Again, we can start by observing the effectiveness of the pull out approach. In fact, pull out is undoubtedly the best way for OA to reach its unique population which might otherwise be lost, or inadequately defined. It can also be reiterated that the provision of a designated reading room is symbolically and practically critical for the program, especially since in all but one of the schools there is only one special reading teacher. The reading center provides a visible identity for the program and a base from which the reading teacher can operate.

The approaches and materials utilized in the classroom as well as the variety of activities observed follow the same format as ARS. Here too the uniform sustained, silent reading (USSR) period was most successful. In fact, OA teachers unanimously acclaimed USSR as a most useful learning device and a positive addition to the program. Again, it is recommended that some USSR periods be used for library work, where appropriate. Supplies are in good shape. Finally, like ARS, the OA Component is staffed by dedicated, experienced teachers who are effective in their work.

Since most OA teachers are the only special reading teachers in their schools, the coordination provided by the District Director of Funded Programs and Reading Consultant proved especially valuable. All

welcomed the aid and assistance offered by these sources. Similarly, the teachers were most enthusiastic about intervisitation meetings which afforded them the opportunity to see what other people were doing in their programs.

Finally, we would again call attention to the following needs:

.....staff training for the minority of teachers who would not meet certification under the new New York State rules.

.....continued and deeper parental involvement; a special problem for this group since the parents come from greater distances. However, one might also expect greater parent interest since the choice of school is voluntary on their part.

.....continued development of writing skills.

Table Two: Optional Assignment: Results of Stanford Achievement Test: Grade Equivalent Scores: Pretest, Predicted Posttest and Actual Posttest Means; Predicted Mean Gain, Actual Mean Gain, and Ratio of Actual to Predicted Mean Gain.

Grade	N	Pretest Mean		Predicted Posttest Mean	Actual Posttest Mean		Predicted Mean Gain	Actual Mean Gain		Ratio of Actual to Predicted Mean Gain
		RS	%ile		RS	%		RS	%	
One	9	9.1	4.4	*	12.8	9.1	*	+3.7	+4.7	*
Two	34		1.48	1.91		2.21	+4.3		+7.3	1.70
Three	51		2.07	2.55		2.91	+4.8		+8.4	1.75
Four	67		2.90	3.47		3.78	+5.7		+8.8	1.54
Five	82		3.29	3.81		4.62	+5.2		+1.33	2.56
Six	76		4.18	4.75		5.06	+5.7		+8.8	1.54
<u>Late Entrants</u>										
Three	3		*	*		*	*		*	*
Four	1		*	*		*	*		*	*
Five	1		*	*		*	*		*	*

(a) Grade One data are raw score (RS) and percentile rankings.

* Data insufficient to compute statistics.

B. Test Results

Using a testing program and calculation method identical to that for ARS (see pages 6-7), we again see in the OA Component significant mean gains at every grade level. As table two indicates, critical ratio of actual to predicted mean gain varies from a minimum of 1.54 in the 4th to 2.56 in 5th grade. In other words, it could be said that the children in this component learned at a minimum $1\frac{1}{2}$ and a maximum slightly over $2\frac{1}{2}$ times as rapidly as they would have learned had there been no special reading program. For the 5th grade, which as it happened involved the largest number of program participants, the actual gain in reading score was over 13 months, a most positive one for a program which began with children who were on an average nearly one year behind grade level in their reading.

Summary

The OA Component complemented the ARS Component of the District 21, Title I reading effort. Its uniqueness was that it operated at non Title I schools and served a target population of educationally disadvantaged children residing in a Title I attendance area but electing to attend District 21 receiving schools. The program was rendered effective through employment of the pull out approach with diagnostic-prescriptive, individualized instruction to small groups of children. Moreover, there was an experienced, dedicated staff plus capable coordination. These various factors combined to produce actual gains in mean reading scores significantly in excess of predicted mean gains at every grade level. Although the OA Component was undeniably successful,

Title I Evaluation.....page 15

further work remains to be done in the areas of library work being integrated into the USSR period, staff training for certification, deeper parental involvement and continued development of writing skills in the context of the reading program.

IMPACT AID COMPONENTS

IMPACT AID - AUGMENTED READING SERVICES
Function Number 5073-98722

IMPACT AID - OPTIONAL ASSIGNMENT
Function Number 5073-98723

The Impact Aid Components of the Title I Reading Program provided additional monies so that another 198 ARS and 47 OA students could be serviced at schools in which the basic Title I components were already located. For the ARS Component, Impact Aid meant 3 additional teachers, 2 full time and one in a .4 position. The schools serviced were PS 288 and PS 329. For the OA Component, there were an additional 4 teachers, 2 in a .1 teaching position and 1 in a .2 teaching position, and 1 in a .4 teaching position. There was also one full time paraprofessional. The schools reached by OA services were JHS 43, IS 96 and PS 238.

The Impact Aid Components thus served to supplement and enhance the District 21, Title I reading effort. These program components began in September of the school year and were operationally fully integrated into the larger effort. This was most appropriate as there was no need to treat them as separate program efforts. Similarly, the components were evaluated at the same time and in the same manner as the ARS and OA components.

Table Three: Impact Aid - Augmented Reading Services: Results of Stanford Achievement Test: Grade Equivalent Scores: Pretest, Predicted Posttest and Actual Posttest Means; Predicted Mean Gain, Actual Mean Gain and Ratio of Actual to Predicted Mean Gain.

Grade a	N	Pretest Mean		Predicted Posttest Mean	Actual Posttest Mean		Predicted Mean Gain	Actual Mean Gain		Ratio of Actual to Predicted Mean Gain
		RS	%ile		RS	%ile		RS	%ile	
One	18	11.3	14	*	14.9	21.7	*	+3.6	+7.7	*
Two	45	1.50		1.95	2.39		+4.5	+8.9		1.98
Three	43	2.31		2.90	2.97		+5.9	+6.6		1.12
Four	66	2.88		3.44	3.72		+5.6	+8.4		1.50
Five	22	3.14		3.62	3.92		+4.8	+7.8		1.63

Late Entrants

Three	1	*	*	*	*	*	*
Four	1	*	*	*	*	*	*
Five	2	*	*	*	*	*	*

(a) Grade 1 data are raw score (RS) and percentile rankings.

* Data inappropriate as insufficient to compute statistics.

Table Four: Impact Aid - Optional Assignment: Results of Stanford Achievement Test: Grade Equivalent Scores: Pretest, Predicted Posttest and Actual Posttest Means; Predicted Mean Gain, Actual Mean Gain and Ratio of Actual to Predicted Mean Gain.

Grade	N	Pretest Mean	Predicted Posttest Mean	Actual Posttest Mean	Predicted Mean Gain	Actual Mean Gain	Ratio of Actual to Predicted Mean Gain
Two	2	*	*	*	*	*	*
Three	4	2.43	*	3.15	*	+7.2	*
Four	6	3.78	*	4.42	*	+6.4	*
Five	4	3.53	*	4.20	*	+6.7	*

<u>Grade</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Pretest Mean</u>	<u>Predicted Posttest Mean</u>	<u>Actual Posttest Mean</u>	<u>Predicted Mean Gain</u>	<u>Actual Mean Gain</u>	<u>Ratio of Actual to Predicted Mean Gain</u>
Six	2	*	*	*	*	*	*
Seven	9	4.57	*	6.30	*	+1.73	*
Eight	15	6.06	6.71	7.95	+1.65	+1.89	2.91
Nine	5	6.14	*	8.18	*	+2.04	*

* Data too small to compute statistics.

Findings: Test Scores

The only unique part of the evaluation of the Impact Aid components was the separate computation of pre and posttest mean scores for the target populations that were serviced. Here again the methodology of score computation and analysis was the same as that employed for ARS and OA (see pages 6 - 7).

Despite the more limited numbers of program participants, the Impact Aid Components also showed themselves to be effective. For ARS, actual exceed predicted mean gains at each grade level serviced. The ratio is lowest in grade 3 where it is 1.12 and highest in grade 2, where the actual is nearly twice the predicted mean gain. (See table three) For OA, other than grade 8, there is an increase in post versus pretest means but the numbers of program participants are too small to perform any meaningful statistical calculations. In grade 8, the actual mean gain is nearly triple the predicted mean gain, a substantial improvement. (See table four)

Summary

The Impact Aid components served to enrich the already effective District 21, Title I reading program. In all, services were rendered at 5 schools with an additional 2 full time teachers, one full time paraprofessional and a variety of fractional positions. Fully integrated into the larger programs, Impact Aid functioned as a most positive addition. A separate analysis of pre and posttest reading scores of Impact Aid participants shows that actual exceeded predicted mean gains at every grade level reached by the program for which it was possible to make calculations.

NON PUBLIC SCHOOL COMPONENT
Function Number 5073-91624

Component Overview

Title I reading program services were also extended to three of the district's non public schools, viz., Ahi Ezer, Lubavitcher and Karlin Stolín, through support of paraprofessional positions for the central NPS programs operating in these schools. At one of the schools, the paraprofessional was employed for 5½ hours daily while the other two schools had paraprofessionals employed for only 10 to 15 hours per week on an hourly basis. In each instance, the paraprofessionals worked directly under the supervision of the teachers who were assigned to the non public school by the Central Board. The approach utilized and activities carried on in these school's mirrored those of the other Title I program components. Program coordination was provided by the Central Board although the District was administratively responsible for the paraprofessionals. In all, a total of 160 students were provided with Title I services through this component.

Findings

The program operated with maximal effectiveness when Central Board program teachers and paraprofessionals provided services every day, or at least four days per week. There is greater program continuity than when teachers meet with participants only one day per week. Much of each week's lesson must necessarily be spent in review of the previous week's assignment.

Title I Evaluation.....page 21

Utilization of paraprofessionals on days when the teacher is not present would allow them to reinforce, during the week, patterns emphasized by the teacher at the time of the weekly lesson.

The statistical analysis of pre and posttest reading scores is to be handled by the New York City Central Board of Education.

TITLE I PROGRAMS

Conclusion and Recommendations

Since the various components of the Title I reading effort made a demonstrable impact in providing supplemental reading services to more than 1900 students in District 21 during the 1978-79 school year, we can only conclude that the program is effective. Its basic logic is sound. It is well implemented. It is staffed by dedicated teachers and paraprofessionals. Finally, it is well administered.

The following recommendations are seen as ways to further improve a well established, sound program:

1. The Title I Reading programs should be recycled. In particular, the pull out approach has proven most effective and ought to be continued.
2. Continue uninterrupted uniform sustained silent reading. Expand this part of the program to include library visits and training in library skills where applicable.
3. Investigate the possibility of creating an in service course designed to help those program teachers lacking New York State certification in reading to obtain it as mandated by the newly revised SED guidelines.
4. Continue, and expand, the involvement of parents in the reinforcement of reading skills learned at school.
5. Continue to develop writing skills as an integral part of the reading program.
6. In the nonpublic schools where Central Board teachers implement a program less than five times per week, paraprofessionals should be allowed to work on an hourly basis on other days of the week to reinforce teacher taught skills.